



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

"1. It is not an adequate means for physical training, being not only very limited in its activities, but actually harmful in its effect on boys less than eighteen or twenty years of age.

"2. It does not offer sufficient opportunity for the development of the individual's power of muscular and mental co-ordination and the exercise of judgment under unusual and trying circumstances.

"3. It does not offer sufficient opportunity for struggle, which requires and develops a spirit of cooperation and self-sacrifice, loyalty, and a strong will.

"4. The most military nations in the world do not have military drill in their schools, but give military instructions and training only after the boys have reached eighteen or twenty years and have received years of physical training as a part of their schooling.

"5. The same qualities that are of most value for war are of most value in peace. Military drill also is inadequate as a preparation for the struggles of peace, such as are necessary to sustain the place of the individual or nation in the pursuit of science, politics, commerce, etc.

"6. Military drill in the schools cannot teach boys the real art of war, since they are too young to handle the real weapons and undergo the rigors of adequate instruction. Hence it is apt to foster a bombastic military spirit of 'tin-soldierism' and a false sense of patriotism which does not appreciate the seriousness of war nor the glories of the struggles of peace."

The authorities at West Point and Annapolis find it necessary to engage instructors of physical training to overcome the evil effects of their military manuals. It is a legitimate objection to such drill that it does not apply to the girls, and that it is not even suited to the varying degrees of boys' physical needs. It is class legislation of the worst type, for the reason that if boys from fourteen to eighteen are to have that kind of special training it should be given to all such boys, especially to those who have left school. Dr. John Dewey remarks:

"The usual experience of military schools (for pupils of this age) shows that the rigid discipline of this part of the training is accompanied by relaxed discipline in everything else, students not feeling full responsibility when not immediately under the direction of others."

The kind of discipline needed by our boys is the discipline which comes from within. The first line of defense in a democracy such as ours is enlightened citizenship, plus an appreciation of the fact that there is an international point of view. Military training to be effective must include, to quote from Dr. Eliot, "marching under a heavy load, digging as rapidly as possible in the ground, and using effectively rifles, machine guns, hand grenades, bayonets, short swords, heavy and light artillery, and motor vehicles, including aéroplanes." Manifestly such training should not begin before the twentieth year. In the language of Dr. Charles E. Jefferson, "The Pequots gave their boys military training. Why should we revert to their stupid and fatal practice?"

It is of importance that we apply our minds unto these arguments. Those opposed to them are working as never before. For example, one of our leading magazines is vigorously promoting an organization of the "High School Volunteers of the United States" for the purpose of promoting the Wyoming system of military

training in all of our public schools. If military training is so necessary before boys can become strong, intelligent, and loyal, one would expect to find these qualities at their best in the army. Let every reader of this editorial ask, Are our trained soldiers stronger than our trained athletes; are they more intelligent than our college graduates; are they more loyal to the ideals upon which this government rests than those of us not versed in the soldier's art?

A BIT OF SILVER LINING

AMERICAN peace workers may well rivet their attention upon and call their confrères to the support of two significant passages in the Naval Appropriation Act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917. The work of the American Peace Society in behalf of these measures is already familiar to the readers of this journal. The first is familiarly known as the Hensley resolution, because first presented by Congressman Walter L. Hensley, of Missouri, and the other as the Shafroth amendment, because, upon the initiative of Mr. Oscar T. Crosby, Senator Shafroth, of Colorado, first presented it in the Senate. The two passages are found under the last section of the bill entitled "Increase of the Navy." They are located in an obscure portion of page 71, which is next to the last page of the bill. The paragraphs, preceded by a declaration relating to armaments, read:

"It is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States to adjust and settle its international disputes through mediation or arbitration, to the end that war may be honorably avoided. It looks with apprehension and disfavor upon a general increase of armament throughout the world, but it realizes that no single nation can disarm, and that without a common agreement upon the subject every considerable power must maintain a relative standing in military strength.

"In view of the premises, the President is authorized and requested to invite, at an appropriate time, not later than the close of the war in Europe, all the great governments of the world to send representatives to a conference which shall be charged with the duty of formulating a plan for a court of arbitration or other tribunal, to which disputed questions between nations shall be referred for adjudication and peaceful settlement, and to consider the question of disarmament and to submit their recommendation to their respective governments for approval. The President is hereby authorized to appoint nine citizens of the United States, who, in his judgment, shall be qualified for the mission by eminence in the law and by devotion to the cause of peace, to be representatives of the United States in such conference. The President shall fix the compensation of said representatives, and such secretaries and other employees as may be needed. Two hundred thousand dollars, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby appropriated and set aside and placed at the disposal of the President to carry into effect the provisions of this paragraph.

"If at any time before the construction authorized by this act shall have been contracted for there shall have been established, with the co-operation of the United States of America, an international tribunal or tribunals competent to secure peaceful determinations of all international disputes, and which shall render unnecessary the maintenance of competitive armaments, then and in that case such naval expenditures as may be inconsistent with the engagements made in the establishment of such tribunal or tribunals may be suspended, when so ordered by the President of the United States."

FRATRICIDAL MADNESS

WE ARE wont to think of the Allies and the Central Powers as two foes struggling to maintain conflicting ideals, and are apt to extend our sympathies to the one side or the other as these vital ideals, as we see them, seem to oppose or coincide with our own. In the main this is a grave error. By so deceiving ourselves we not only miss what is the deepest and most disquieting fact of the present war, but we also allow our emotions to be misled and permit ourselves to be more and more confused. The great pathos of the war lies in the fact that the two armies of Europe, like an encampment alarmed at midnight and thrown into blind confusion, are flying at each other's throats not for conflicting ideals, but for the same ideals. In terms of idealism—the most sacred standard for which mankind can contend—it is not merely a struggle of right against wrong, but in a large sense a war of brethren, of followers of the same high standard, of heroes who are bravely dying and slaying for the same great principles, which should unite them and which in the past have united them with bonds of steel. It is a blind scramble in the dark, a slaughter of friends and co-idealists, permitted to prolong its horror and unnatural madness through the misunderstandings and muddled thinking in which it was initiated. "Right" is on both sides; "wrong" is on both sides.

One who attempts to paint the madness of the present war begins a measureless task. The millions of boys, many of them fine, most of them heroic, who have been cut down and are now rotting in or on the fields of Europe, present a picture of an infinite pathos. The blighted homes search out our deepest feelings. The wealth and the non-economic values that are gone—these enter into the tragedy.

But there is yet a more frenzied wildness in it all. We in this country are especially aware of the elements of idealism at the basis of the effort of the Allied Powers. England, for example, holds this war to be a war of right against wrong, and believes naturally that England is wholly on the side of the right. It is inconceivable to her to yield her demands for Belgium, the Bal-

kans, or northern France. She believes in the effectiveness of might, and frankly says so in terms of a mighty navy; but she does not propose to yield Europe to "the menace of militarism." She is keenly aware that she has a navy and resources over the seas, and she feels that by means of these it is her duty to uphold her "national honor" and "world responsibility." She believes that the principles of "freedom" and "justice" are now vitally at stake. She is sorry about our mails and the interference with neutral trade; but she calls attention to the fact that she is carrying the heavy end of the job, and she can't understand why we should be so particular. She insists that she is pursuing the goal of "true nationalism," and that there must be some "guarantee that this thing shall not happen again." If the English mind does not stop here, if it goes on in terms of self-defensive argument to censor ideas and to curtail freedom of expression, it is all aimed, as she believes, against evil ideas and wrongful utterance. She pleads for and is bleeding for the "free development of racial units" and for "a peace founded upon justice."

The pathetic madness about all this is that the Central Powers are pleading for essentially the same things and often in the same language. True, both sides are under grave suspicion because of a certain equivocal quality in their profession, and these equivocal professions, due to a certain vagueness, promote and prolong the war. Recriminations follow in natural sequence and intensity.

If an average American audience were asked if it has been England's desire for power, consuming jealousy, and limitless cravings for the riches of the world that have produced practically all of the European wars, the answer would be, No; but the Germans believe the answer should be, Yes. Has England been guilty of countless political intrigues, decapitating every prosperous European State, and mercilessly destroying the sea-power of every possible competitor? The Germans would say, Yes. Did the British Empire rob the Spanish treasure-ships? Did she rob Canada and the "States" from the French, Gibraltar from the Spaniards, India from the French and Portuguese, South Africa from the Dutch, Egypt and Cyprus from the Turks, Malta from the Italians? The Germans say, Yes. Who gave Morocco to the sword of France, Tripoli to the sword of Italy, and who would give Constantinople to the sword of Russia? England. Where in all the world are so many broken treaties and scraps of paper as in Downing street? Who would fix the clutch of Russia upon mid-Europe, of Japan upon China and the Pacific? By whom was opium forced upon China and the world, debasing human beings for gold? Germany's answer to all these is, England.

For these reasons the Germans believe that England is